

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-6197**

---

TERRANCE ADAMS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

ROBERT M. STEVENSON, III, Warden Broad River Correctional  
Institution,

Respondent - Appellee,

and

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

Respondent.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Columbia. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., District  
Judge. (3:12-cv-01482-JFA)

---

Submitted: June 26, 2014

Decided: July 1, 2014

---

Before WILKINSON, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Terrance Adams, Appellant Pro Se. Donald John Zelenka, Senior  
Assistant Attorney General, William Edgar Salter, III, Assistant  
Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Terrance Adams seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition and the court's order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2012). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2012). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Adams has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED